



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,521	10/09/2001	Ian Hirschsohn	NVDA/P002816	7287
26290 7590 05/29/2008 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P. 3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD SUITE 1500 HOUSTON, TX 77056				
EXAMINER				
TRUONG, CAMQUY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2195				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,521

Applicant(s)

HIRSCHSOHN, IAN

Examiner

CAMQUY TRUONG

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-9, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6-9, and 11-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, and 11-12 are presented for examination. Claims 2-3, 5, and 10 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 7-8, 9, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Lutterschmidt (U.S. Patent 6,356,947 B1) in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,343,333 B1).

4. As to claims 1, 7-8, 9, and 11, Lutterschmidt teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: in a multi-processor computing environment, a method executed by a first processor for allocating resources for use by plurality of other processors (the central server node AS controls the assignment between the client node and the respective data server nodes, col. 3, lines 59-62), the method comprising:

Providing a script to the first processor (receiving status data relating), the first processor being dedicated solely to parsing the script and to the allocation of resources (data server nodes) to the plurality other processors, the script containing information related to the resources required by the other processors (receiving status data relating to the utilization of capacity of the data server nodes and the content of the data sets stored in the data server nodes, and dynamically assign to the requesting client node on the basis to of an evaluation of the status data, one of the data server nodes in which a data set with the specified content is stored, col. 8, line 60- col. 9, line 6; col. 5, lines 49-60);

Parsing script to determine the resources required by the plurality of other processors (evaluation of the status data, one of the data server nodes in which a data set with the specified content is stored to assign to the requesting client node, col. 9, lines 21-23); and

Dynamically allocating the resources as needed by the plurality of other processors (dynamically assign to the requesting client node one of the data server nodes; col. 9, lines 2-4).

5. Lutterschmidt does not explicitly teach the script contains the execution sequence of an application (task). However, Matsumoto teaches the script contains the execution sequence of an application (task), (a script processing system, which controls execution based on texts called as scripts in which a processing sequence of application program is described, col. 1, lines 12-14).

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lutterschmidt with Matsumoto's script contains the execution sequence of an application because this would reduce a burden for user from performing an operation for specifying script file relating to the service.
7. As to claim 12, Lutterschmidt teaches dynamically allocating the resources at the time needed by the tasks (col. 9, lines 2-4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lutterschmidt (U.S. Patent 6,356,947 B1) in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,343,333 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pitot (U.S. Patent 5,375,208).

9. As to claims 4 and 6, Lutterschmidt, and Matsumoto do not explicitly teach the resources are memory and matrix configuration. However, Pitot teaches the resources are memory and matrix configuration (col. 1, lines 40-45).
10. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of a resources are memory and matrix configuration as taught by Pitot because this would allow dynamic allocation of memory locations when needed so that the memory resource is optimized.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM – 5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2195

have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

/Meng-Ai An/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195